DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 937 HE 001 505

TITLE	Plans for Progress
INSTITUTION	Tennessee Higher Education Commission, Nashville.
PUB DATE	17 Feb 69
NOTE	28p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Tennessee Higher Education Commission, 507 State Office Building, Nashville, Tennessee 37219
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.50
DESCRIPTORS	College Programs, Community Colleges, Degrees (Titles), *Educational Planning, *Governance, *Higher Education, Junior Colleges, *Planning, *State Colleges, State Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Tennessee

ABSTRACT

This report is the first section of a "Long Range Plan for Higher Education in Tennessee" by the Tennessee Higher Education Commission. It deals with thee general level and type of program offerings at each of the public institutions and makes recommendations to the Governor and General Assembly on governance of the state's public colleges and universities. Recommended goals for higher education include: (1) opportunity for all who have the ability and interest, (2) a system of public institutions, (3) state programs for advanced graduate and professional study, (4) financial support for state programs, and (5) full accreditation for all programs. Specific recommendations include the development of (1) a community college system by 1975, (2) doctoral programs for Memphis State University, (3) undergraduate and other programs, (4) a study of the need for additional doctoral programs, and (5) establishment of one board to govern the state community colleges, and another to govern the six state universities. (AF)

ED038937

PLANS FOR PROGRESS

This is the first section of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission's Long Range Plan for Higher Education in Tennessee. This report will be considered and acted on by the Commission at a meeting on February 17, 1969 in Nashville, Tennessee. This report is furnished in advance to give interested persons an opportunity to study it, and to provide the Commission with comment and criticism prior to the final consideration of the report.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Additional copies may be obtained from the Commission Offices, 507 State Office Building, Nashville, Tennessee 37219.

HE001 505

INTRODUCTION

The Act creating the Tennessee Higher Education Commission gave it the responsibility "to develop a master plan for the future development of public higher education in Tennessee, taking into account the programs and functions of each of the existing institutions, and to make recommendations to the governing boards of the various institutions and to the Governor and General Assembly for the implementation of the plan."

An effective long range plan should provide guidelines for the development of higher education in Tennessee that are sufficiently flexible to permit each institution to develop and manage its educational programs, and yet sufficiently clear and definite to provide for an efficient and effective system of public higher education in the state. This initial part of the plan deals with the general level and type of program offerings at each of the public institutions, and makes recommendations to the Governor and General Assembly about the way that our public colleges and universities should be organized and governed.

The Commission believes that the recommendations presented in this report will be beneficial to the development of higher education in the state, but it should be recognized that this plan is not designed to provide a permanent blueprint for higher education; educational conditions change rapidly, and changes will be needed in these recommendations from time to time so that they will fit changing needs and circumstances.

A number of additional more detailed sections of the long range plan will be developed and submitted in the next year, and by the end of 1969 most sections of the long range plan should be available.

METHOD OF DEVELOPING THE PLAN

In the development of this part of the plan the Commission members have had the benefit of advice from the Commissioner of Education and the presidents of all public institutions, a brief statement from each institution of its own plans and objectives, and the advice of four general consultants from out of state.

Each institution prepared and submitted to the Commission, in June of 1968, a brief statement of plans for program development by 1980, including a summary of enrollment expected, new programs to be developed, and plans for the future development of graduate programs in areas where the institution was already offering work at the baccalaureate or master's levels. Information from these statements is included in the next section, and each statement is on file in the Commission offices.

During July and August the Commission arranged for four experienced consultants to review the institutional plans and to visit each of the public institutions in the state, and to discuss development plans with the administrative leaders of each institution. The consultants were:

Dr. A. J. Brumbaugh, Consultant to the Southern Regional Education Board, former President of Shimer College and former Vice President of the American Council on Education

Dr. Arthur D. Browne, Associate Director of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, and former Director of the Utah Coordinating Commission on Higher Education

Dr. Otis Singletary, Vice Chancellor of the University of Texas System, and former Vice President of the American Council on Education

Dr. James Wattenbarger, Director of the Institute for Higher Education at the University of Florida, and former Director of Community Colleges for Florida

The consultants met with the Commission members in an all day discussion

of the functions of each institution and the possibilities and alternatives for organizing higher education. During September the Commission members met with each college president, either individually or in small groups to get their opinions about the best way of organizing public higher education in the state.

The Commission met again with all of the college presidents (except three who were unable to be present) in November to discuss both the role and functions of each institution and to discuss further the questions of organization. In preparing the present document for Commission consideration, the staff had the benefit of all the studies and meetings described above, and in addition, assembled a variety of information on enrollments, finances, and programs in each of the institutions.

The present report is being presented in draft form in order to give legislators, educators, and interested citizens an opportunity to discuss the plan and to express their opinions to the Commission at a public meeting to be held by the Commission for the purpose of considering the report.

GOALS FOR PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN TENNESSEE

The State of Tennessee should provide opportunities for higher education for all citizens who have the ability and interest in attending college. Tennessee has made good progress in the past decade in expanding opportunities for college attendance. In 1960, total Tennessee college enrollment was 15.6 percent of the 18-24 year old population in the state, by 1968 it was 25 percent, and by 1975 we estimate it will be 35 percent. If the state achieves the goal of college enrollment that is 35 percent of the college age population it will approximate the national average level of attendance.

These projected levels of attendance assume that additional community colleges will be established in the next five or six years. Unless they are added to our system of higher education, the state will probably not be able to educate as many of its young people as other states will be educating.

These projections assume that most of the expanded opportunities for higher education will have to be provided in public institutions, which probably will add about 75,000 students by 1980 to the 79,380 that were enrolled in the Fall of 1968. The private institutions will probably expand about 50 percent by 1980, according to their own plans, which will mean the addition of about 12-15,000 students. If past trends are any guide, about 6-9,000 of these additional students will be from Tennessee and the remainder will be out-of-state students. The private sector of higher education provides an important diversity of educational opportunities in the state, and the state should not take any actions in higher education that will be detrimental to the continued strength of private institutions. The private institutions have been interested in the provision of state scholarship assistance to students in private institutions, and this, and other aspects of the relations of public and private higher education in Tennessee will be covered in a subsequent part of the long range plan.

The state should provide a system of public institutions which furnish the educational programs, research, and services in higher education required by the economic and social development needs of the state. Some specialized services and educational programs are now, and may continue to be, provided by interstate arrangements or by special contractual agreements with private institutions in the state, but the state should accept the responsibility of providing most of the programs within its public institutions.

Many of the program offerings, such as those in education, business, and nursing will have to be duplicated in most of the public institutions to meet the heavy demands of the state for graduates. But others of a much more highly specialized nature, such as bio-engineering or nuclear physics should be concentrated in a single program offered by a single institution. The objective should be to assure that whatever is offered is of good quality, and that programs will be duplicated only when the demand for graduates, and the number of potential students is sufficient to support programs in several institutions. Studies of major program areas, such as engineering, nursing, education, agriculture, and other fields, which will be undertaken in the next year will provide the basis for detailed determination of programs that need to be expanded further, and those that may need consolidation.

The state should provide advanced graduate and professional program offerings to serve the demands of an expanding number of Tennessean's who will seek education beyond the baccalaureate degree. Graduate and advanced professional enrollment is growing more rapidly than any other part of higher education. Tennessee, with a little more than 11% of its public university students enrolled at the post-baccalaureate level, is slightly below the comparable national average percentage. By 1980 advanced-degree enrollment in the public universities (exclusive of the Memphis Medical Units) is projected to more than double (from about 8,000 to 17,000 - 20,000). To provide for this number of students, the state will have to develop more than one comprehensive graduate program. A recommended pattern for graduate development is described in a later section of this report. It follows the principle of providing the needed graduate programs in as economical and efficient a manner as possible by developing existing graduate programs to an efficient size before beginning new programs.

The state should support all of its programs of higher education at a level which will enable the institution to compete effectively for faculty, and to provide the equipment, supplies, and facilities needed for a modern program of instruction. At the present time Tennessee is not keeping pace with the leading states of the Southeast in supporting higher education. Unless support can be increased more rapidly, it will be impossible to expand enrollment fast enough to keep up with student demand, start new graduate and professional programs, and at the same time maintain a quality staff. A more detailed report on the financial requirements for achievement of the educational goals described here will be presented in the next few months. Unless adequate support can be obtained, the enrollment growth and new program development described below will have to proceed at a slower rate.

There are a number of professional programs in the public universities that have not been accredited by the appropriate professional accrediting association. Some of these programs are new, which explains their unaccredited status, but others have been in existence for a number of years. It should be a goal of the state to achieve full accreditation of all its programs, and each institution should obtain accreditation for its existing programs before new ones are started.

The goals for public higher education described here are very general, but they are also fundamental. In remaining sections of this report, and in subsequent reports they will be spelled out in more detail. In view of Tennessee's needs to continue its industrialization, its economic development, and its social progress in harnessing technology to the improvement of life in the state, we cannot afford to fall short of these goals.

FUNCTIONS AND PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

As indicated above, the State of Tennessee should have a system of public institutions that provide the full range of educational programs, research, and service required in a modern complex society. At least three general types of institutions will be needed in the state. The state already has these types of institutions, but the number of each type, and the types of programs they will offer, need to be specified in more detail:

I. Community Colleges which provide two years of collegiate work, one and two year occupational and technical terminal programs of less than baccalaureate level, and continuing education programs for adults of both a credit and non-credit nature. Community colleges should be located within commuting distance of most of the high school graduates in the state. The state has six community colleges now, and should plan for a total of 12 to 15 community colleges by 1975. A detailed plan for the development of community colleges is currently being prepared and will be available within the next month.

II. Regional colleges and universities that emphasize undergraduate preparation in arts and sciences and in selected professional fields. These institutions also give work at the master's degree level and perform a limited amount of research in some areas and provide some public service functions. In the future some of these institutions will offer more advanced degree programs, including limited programs at the doctoral level. In Tennessee all of the institutions under the State Board of Education and the University of Tennessee at Martin have been predominantly undergraduate institutions of this type, although Memphis State has been developing into a more comprehensive

university. It is envisioned that these institutions will continue to be predominantly undergraduate institutions, and that they will not develop highly specialized programs, a major research emphasis, or large public service commitments.

III. Complex multipurpose universities that offer advanced graduate and professional work and have a major research and public service function. The University of Tennessee at Knoxville and the UT Medical Center in Memphis are the public institutions of this type in the state, and Memphis State is developing in this direction.

Any state needs a balanced development of all of these types of institutions because they serve varied educational needs for varied groups of students. Tennessee has been late in developing a community college system, but is has made an excellent start, and there is no reason that it can't have one of the best systems in the nation. An additional six to nine community colleges will be needed, including one in each metropolitan area of more than 250,000 people, to provide a complete community college system. In 1967 only 2,300 students were enrolled in the community colleges, if the system is expanded as recommended, 20-25,000 students will be enrolled in community colleges by 1975.

Tennessee's regional universities and the campuses of the University of Tennessee are well located geographically, and with the addition of the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga there are enough degree granting institutions to serve the undergraduate and master's degree educational needs of the state for the foreseeable future. Therefore, the Commission is not recommending the establishment of any additional degree granting campuses between now and 1980. Because they have been well located and generally well managed, and because Tennessee has not had a community college system until very recently, the regional universities have grown to a larger size and have developed a broader

range of programs and services including more master's degree programs, than similar institutions in most Southeastern states. In neighboring states, only Kentucky has developed regional universities of comparable size and scope.

All of the public degree granting institutions are of sufficient size now (3,000 students or above) to offer comprehensive undergraduate curricula in liberal arts and selected professional fields in an economical and efficient manner. While there may be selected programs, even at the larger universities, which are too small for efficient operation, in general Tennessee will not face the problem of institutions that are too small to operate efficient programs. By 1975 we expect all of the public universities to enroll at least 5,000 students, and the two largest (UT Knoxville and Memphis State) will be close to the maximum size they should plan to reach.

There are several reasons for recommending maximum enrollments at Memphis State and UT Knoxville. In the first place there are no appreciable gains in operating efficiency associated with growth beyond 10-15,000 students. The basic enrollment factors in efficiency are determined at the program level (that is, you have to have a minimum enrollment in each program if you are to achieve an efficient operation) but with reasonable planning, it should be possible to have nearly all programs in a large complex university operating at an efficient level when an enrollment level of 15,000 students is reached. The point of diminishing returns in operating efficiency depends on the number of different programs offered, but even the most complex universities like the UT Knoxville campus which offer over 200 different majors and over 50 different doctoral degree programs, will be able to achieve an efficient operation with 15,000 to 20,000 students.

In the second place, growth beyond 25,000 students on any campus produces more complex problems of traffic, campus planning, scheduling, and similar logistic problems. Just as our very large cities are increasingly difficult to govern, so the management problems of the very large university will also increase. The University of Tennessee at Knoxville, the only institution of over 20,000 students at the present time, has done a good job of planning for growth, but they should plan to limit the total size of the Knoxville campus to 27,000 to 28,000 students. Similarly, Memphis State should plan to limit the maximum size of their campus to approximately 25,000. More detailed studies of these upper limits should be made in the next year to determine more precisely the best methods of achieving these limits, and their implications for specific program size.

The Commission's enrollment projections for each public campus are shown in Table 1. They indicate clearly that there are enough degree granting institutions in Tennessee at the present time to accommodate the undergraduate enrollments expected by 1980 in institutions of reasonable size. This assumes that the community college system of the state will continue to be expanded. If the additional community colleges are not started on a regular schedule, the state will either have much more growth in its regional universities, or, will have to face the question of whether or not to start some additional four year institutions. Whatever the state might "save" if it did not add more community colleges, would probably be more than dissipated in the additional costs of providing for these students in other institutions.

The state currently has one comprehensive doctoral level university (the University of Tennessee at Knoxville) and one specialized doctoral level university (the University of Tennessee Memphis Medical Units), and is developing

a second doctoral level university (Memphis State University). We recommend that Memphis State should be developed into a second comprehensive doctoral level institution.

In the next decade Memphis State University should be developed into a second comprehensive doctoral level institution. It has by far the best geographic location, it has already begun doctoral work in three fields (Education, Psychology, and Chemistry), it has a substantial graduate enrollment, and it has plans to expand its programs into other fields as resources become available. Memphis State should not attempt to match all of the programs at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville. In many highly specialized fields the state will not for the foreseeable future need more than one advanced degree program, and where these are already in existence at Knoxville they should not be planned at Memphis. Instead, Memphis State should emphasize its location in a major metropolitan area, and other unique resources which it may have in planning advanced graduate programs, research, and service activities that do not overlap with those of the University of Tennessee except in the standard fields where the state will need to develop more than one advanced degree program. Examples of areas where duplication will be needed include most of the arts and sciences, education, and possibly one or two other professional areas. Memphis State should probably be offering 20 to 30 different doctoral programs by 1980. In all of their advanced degree planning and development their plans should be carefully coordinated with those of the University of Tennessee at Knoxville, to assure that those programs that are needed the most, and where student demand is greatest, will be developed first.

In service to the state, there will be an especial need to coordinate the programs of Memphis State and UT Knoxville, to assure that they do not overlap

unduly, and that each institution is making an effective contribution to the state's total needs for service.

Even the development of the University of Tennessee and Memphis State will probably not meet all the student demands for doctoral programs by 1980. A third doctoral level institution will be needed. A number of neighboring states (Missouri, Virginia, North Carolina and Georgia, which are comparable in size to Tennessee) already have two or more doctoral institutions or campuses, and all are planning additional doctoral institutions or campuses.

The reason these states are planning additional doctoral level universities is that our modern technological society demands these advanced degree specialists in ever increasing numbers. More and more students become aware of the need to obtain advanced degrees, and so student demand is increasing rapidly. In a national survey in 1961, about 30 percent of college freshmen said they planned to go on to graduate or professional school after they got their bachelor's degree. In a repeat survey, in 1966, 60 percent of the freshmen said they had plans for advanced study. While not all of these students will get to graduate school, the rapid rise in the expectations for graduate work indicates that student demand will be high.

In 1968, there are approximately 8,200 graduate students enrolled in Tennessee public institutions, exclusive of the UT Medical Center. Slightly more than half (4,200) are enrolled in the UT System, about a fourth (2,000) are enrolled at Memphis State and the remaining 2,000 are enrolled on the other five regional university campuses. By 1980 there will be a student demand for enrollment of at least 17,000 to 20,000 graduate students in the public universities, and there could be an even larger demand.

To accommodate this demand, the UT System, including all campuses and the graduate centers should plan to enroll 9-11,000 graduate students, with 6-7,000 of these on the Knoxville campus. With graduate enrollment at this level, nearly all of the programs could have enough graduate students for an efficient program. While the level of enrollment required for efficient operation varies in different programs, in most doctoral degree programs 50 to 100 students are needed for an efficient program, above this enrollment level, there are no particular economic advantages to more graduate students, although there may be some educational advantages.

With 6,000-7,000 graduate and advanced professional students by 1980, nearly all the graduate programs at UT Knoxville should be large enough for effective operation both from an economic and educational point of view. Further growth beyond this level probably should not be planned, but this question should be re-examined in the mid 1970's.

Memphis State should plan for 4,000-5,000 graduate and advanced professional students by 1980. This should be sufficient to assure that all of their programs are operating at an efficient and educationally effective level of enrollment, even if doctoral degree programs are offered in 30 fields, and masters degree programs in an additional 30 or 40 fields.

With these levels of graduate enrollment in the UT System and Memphis State, there will probably be 3,000-6,000 additional graduate students to be accommodated in the other public universities (in addition there will be several thousand in the private universities--mostly at Vanderbilt and Peabody). The need for one or more additional institutions that offer doctoral programs by 1980 will be required by student demand. There are several possibilities for meeting this demand.

Tennessee could follow the pattern of some of the other Southern states and develop, in the late 1970's, a third and fourth comprehensive public university with a full range of doctoral program offerings. Or it could provide for a more limited and specialized development of doctoral programs at several of the remaining universities. For example East Tennessee might limit its program development to education and the arts and humanities, staying out of doctoral work in the expensive science areas and other professional fields. Tennessee Tech might develop doctoral programs in engineering, math and science, and exclude other areas. Middle Tennessee might emphasize business and the related arts and sciences field. This type of more specialized and limited doctoral program development is more difficult to coordinate and to manage, but it may be more consistent with the present level of institutional development in Tennessee's regional universities, and with the institutional plans and ambitions for offering advanced graduate degrees.

Tennessee's regional universities, with the exception of Tennessee A & I State University, all give as one of their objectives by 1980 the development of graduate programs at the doctoral level. These plans are described on the chart below.

The institutional plans and ambitions for the development of doctoral programs by five of the six institutions under the State Board of Education and by the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga present one of the major issues in the development of an adequate long-range plan. The state does not need, nor can it afford to develop this many comprehensive universities with doctoral programs.

Major Areas	University of Tennessee Knox-ville	Chatt-anooga	Martin	Memphis State	East Tenn	Middle Tenn	Tenn Tech	Austin Peay	Tenn A & I
Science	Ø	x	-	Ø	x	x	x	-	-
Social Science	Ø	-	-	x	x	x	-	-	-
Arts & Human-ities	Ø	-	-	-	x	x	-	-	-
Business	Ø	-	-	x	x	x	-	-	-
Education	Ø	-	-	Ø	x	x	x	x	-
Health Sciences	Ø	-	-	-	x	-	-	-	-
Engineering	Ø	-	-	x	-	-	x	-	-

Ø - Programs already offered x - Programs Proposed - No Program Proposed

Before recommending a pattern for doctoral program development, it is well to consider some of the financial aspects of the problem. With the limited resources Tennessee is now providing for public higher education (Tennessee ranks 10th among 12 Southeastern states in both per capita and per student appropriations for public higher education), a pattern of development must be planned that the state is willing to support. It makes no sense to start new programs if existing programs are too poorly supported to achieve an adequate level of quality.

The costs of starting new doctoral programs are of several different kinds, but it is useful to think of the costs in terms of the general requirement for an institution to offer doctoral work in any field. These include the provision of a competetive salary schedule, which will allow the attraction and retention of a graduate faculty and the working conditions which allow time for research and scholarly activity. On top of these general requirements are the specific requirements for the equipment, facilities, and faculty to operate each new degree program. Because of the general costs involved, it will be somewhat more costly to develop several specialized doctoral programs in several of the regional universities than it would be to develop a single one of them as a third comprehensive doctoral level university.

However, the additional costs of adding a doctoral program on top of a good master's program may be relatively small if the general level of support has been sufficient to allow the recruitment of a good faculty and the development of a library and research facilities.

At the present time, only the University of Tennessee at Knoxville has faculty salaries and working conditions which are adequate for the operation of an advanced graduate school, and even UT's faculty salaries are below the regional average (and even further behind the national average). The State Board institutions, including Memphis State, all have faculty salaries and teaching loads that will greatly retard the development and maintenance of graduate programs of good quality at the doctoral level. Substantial additional investments per student will be required to bring the regional universities to a level where adequate doctoral programs can be offered. As Tennessee moves toward program budgeting on a formula basis, there will be more of a base of support for master's level graduate programs which can provide the faculty and other funds needed to initiate doctoral programs. This will be especially true in the relatively low cost graduate areas such as education and the humanities and social sciences.

With the present prospects for the support of higher education in the state, it is recommended that doctoral programs in the state in the next five or six years be concentrated on three campuses: The University of Tennessee at Knoxville, Memphis State University, and the UT Medical Center, and that the need to develop doctoral programs in the regional universities be reassessed in the early 1970's, when new demands can be demonstrated. The prospects for adequate funding of additional doctoral programs can also be reassessed in the early 1970's;at present the resources for higher education appear too limited to enable the state to support new doctoral program development (except at UT Knoxville and

Memphis State) and also fulfull its other commitments.

The costs of developing doctoral programs at Memphis State will require a substantial increase in faculty salaries (about 15% to bring them up to the UT level) and a substantial decrease in average faculty load (about 25%) as well as larger expenditures for equipment and organized research.

As indicated above highly specialized graduate and professional offerings that are needed in only one location in the state should be concentrated on the Knoxville campus unless there are special factors which suggest they would be more appropriate at the Medical Center or at Memphis State. The University of Tennessee should limit its graduate programs in off-campus centers (such as Kingsport and Nashville) to the master's level; at the doctoral level students should be expected to go to the programs rather than the state attempting to take the programs to the students.

In the next four or five years UT Chattanooga, UT Martin, and the regional universities, except Memphis State, should concentrate on developing solid master's degree programs and improving the quality of their professional programs so that they are all accredited by the appropriate professional group. Developing strong undergraduate programs and master's degree programs and achieving full accreditation of all professional degree programs should take priority over the development of new doctoral programs on all of the public university campuses.

UT-Martin, Tennessee A & I State University, and Austin Peay should plan to continue as predominantly undergraduate universities, concentrating on the provision of high quality undergraduate programs and graduate programs at the master's level. There seems little likelihood that there will be any need for, or justification of, the development of doctoral programs at any of these institutions between now and 1980. Austin Peay is the only one of these three

institutions that has proposed to develop a doctoral program, and their plan is obviously a long range one.

There are a number of special problems associated with the development of Tennessee A & I. The court has ordered that it accelerate desegregation. This process will require substantial improvement of the university's programs and closer relationships with existing institutions in the Nashville area, particularly with the UT-Nashville Center and Middle Tennessee State University. These aspects of the development of public education will be covered in detail in the plan for desegregation which is to be submitted to the court by April 1, 1969.

Careful studies of each major professional program area will be made to determine approximate capacity of existing programs, changes in student demand, number of potential students to be served by 1975 and 1980, demand for graduates, and types and location of program expansion. Studies are already underway in Engineering and Nursing, and within this year the Commission expects to complete studies of Business, Education, Library Science, and Home Economics. The Commission plans to launch studies of Medicine, Law, Social Work, and Agriculture during the coming year.

The recommendations of the Commission are generally consistent with the plans of the institutions, except that: (1) No firm commitment can be made at this time about the timing of additional doctoral program development. This will be a disappointment to those institutions that want to start doctoral programs in the immediate future. Tennessee Tech has already submitted a proposal to the Higher Education Commission for a Ph.D. in engineering science, which is being reviewed at the present time by outside consultants as a part of the study of engineering education in the state. East Tennessee has been planning a

doctoral program in Education but has not submitted any formal request for a program. (2) Austin Peay wants to develop a doctoral program in Education which is recommended to be delayed for the indefinite future.

The limitations of resources for higher education in the state make it necessary to set priorities for development of higher education. These plans call for first priority to be given to expanding and strengthening existing programs with the particular attention to those that do not meet accreditation standards now. Also, first priority is given to the expansion and strengthening of graduate programs at Memphis State University, so that it may develop into a strong graduate university. The expansion of the community college system is also a first priority objective. Meeting these and providing for the normal growth and increasing costs of education are likely to require all of the resources that are available in the next few years. If more funds can be made available, then a start can be made sooner in developing additional doctoral programs at the regional universities, provided that a need for these programs can be demonstrated at the time they are proposed.

ORGANIZATION OF PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN TENNESSEE

Education in Tennessee has grown enormously in the last ten years. College enrollments have nearly tripled and appropriations for higher education are more than five times as great as they were a decade ago. The state has added six community colleges, is adding one degree granting institution, three technical institutes, and 22 area vocational schools to their educational system. All of the degree granting colleges have become universities. The entire system of higher education has become more complex and much more expensive to operate.

Only a few changes in organization have occurred to deal with this explosive growth. This year the University of Tennessee reorganized into a system with the President and his staff responsible for all campuses, while each campus is administered directly by a Chancellor and his staff. This system development should be very beneficial in the effective management of the multi campus operations of the University of Tennessee.

The present organization of higher education in the state does not contribute very well to an organization based on institutional purpose and function. The University of Tennessee System has four campuses, each of a different type, ranging from predominantly undergraduate (Martin) to complex multipurpose advanced graduate (Knoxville). In addition, the University operates several centers - some of these are entirely graduate and others are predominantly undergraduate programs.

If any reorganization of education along functional lines is planned, (that is, complex universities under one board, community colleges under another, etc.) then the diversity of the educational operations of the University of Tennessee would require that some parts of the system be taken out from under the UT Board.

The State Board of Education also has a very diverse set of institutions, ranging from community colleges and technical institutes to Memphis State, which the Commission recommends should develop into a complex multipurpose university. Functional reorganization would also change the institutions now in the State Board System. In addition, the State Board is responsible for the public schools, the special schools, and 23 area vocational schools. With the advent of a large number of special federal programs in vocational education, aid to disadvantaged students, guidance and counseling, and many other areas, the State Board of Education and the staff of the State Board has expanded its

functions and programs enormously. No single board can give sufficient attention to such a diverse group of educational activities to provide adequate policy guidance for them, and it is very difficult to organize an adequate staff to give proper attention to the diverse functions. Almost inevitably some functions will get more attention than others; for example community colleges or the special schools might preoccupy the Board at one time, while the university problems or the requirements of special federal programs might get most of the attention at another time. The Board and top staff leadership will not be able to give much attention to any one institution or educational program.

The problems and policy issues of the universities differ from those of grades one through twelve, and the special schools and area vocational schools present still another set of problems. No one group of citizens, no matter how dedicated and hard working, can be expected to be sufficiently familiar with all these areas and their problems to do an effective job of policy making in all of them. Most states have recognized this and have separated responsibility for policy making and governing in higher education from the responsibilities for policy making for elementary and secondary education.

This obvious need for reorganization is a top priority problem which the Commission believes should be dealt with now. Reorganization was a step recommended by all of the consultants, and the Commission considered several different alternatives. These alternatives, and their pros and cons were outlined in a Legislative Council study in 1964, which was very helpful to the Commission. The Commission gave serious attention to three different possibilities and considered two or three other alternatives that were not felt to be desirable.

The first possibility would be to place all of public higher education under a single board. This proposal was advocated by several of the college presidents and by the Commissioner of Education. In the South, Georgia has this pattern of

organization, and Florida and Mississippi have a modification of it with all the degree granting institutions under one board and the community colleges under other boards. This type of organization can provide for effective coordination and control of institutional development, but it can lead to a tendency to treat all institutions alike and has a leveling influence in the distribution of funds. This makes it difficult to develop strong graduate programs or centers of excellence of any kind.

None of our consultants thought that this would be the best system for Tennessee. They felt that the higher education system was too large and complex to develop effectively under a single board and staff. With ten degree granting campuses and twelve to fifteen community colleges, the relationship of the Board and the central staff with any one campus and its problems would be necessarily remote. Uniform rules would not fit all campuses equally well, and it would be difficult to develop each institution's unique programs and purposes. They believed that there should be several boards for different types of institutions with coordination of all programs provided by the Higher Education Commission.

The Commission considered several multi-board alternatives. All of them included a recommendation for a separate board for the community colleges. With six community colleges established now and six to nine more needed, these institutions will need a board of their own. A detailed discussion of the community college board will be provided in the recommendations on community colleges to be presented in March. In summary, this board should have nine members appointed by the Governor for staggered nine year terms. No county with a community college should have more than one member from that county on the community college board. It should have formal liason with the State Board of Education, and a competent professional staff headed by an experienced community college administrator to

provide full-time professional guidance and coordination of the community colleges. If the Legislature acts favorably on this proposal, the community college board could be created in the summer of 1969. It should be given a year to recruit a staff and prepare to take over full operational responsibility on July 1, 1970, the beginning of a new fiscal year.

ALTERNATIVES FOR THE DEGREE GRANTING INSTITUTIONS

The Commission considered the possibility of having all the comprehensive doctoral institutions in the state (UT-Knoxville, Memphis State, and UT-Medical) under the Trustees of the University of Tennessee and having a new board for the regional universities which would include Austin Peay, East Tennessee, Middle Tennessee, Tennessee A & I, Tennessee Tech, and UT-Martin. This plan would group the institutions by functions and would provide a more homogeneous group of institutions for each board to manage. The Commission felt that this had a number of logical advantages, but it had one major drawback that kept the Commission from making this recommendation. The institutions that would be involved did not want to make this change at this time. UT-Martin wished to remain in the UT System. Many of the supporters of Memphis State, as well as a number of Memphis citizens, felt the institution would lose its identity as a separate university if it became a part of the University of Tennessee System.

While these are not primarily educational reasons, the opinions and attitudes of the persons involved are always relevant to decisions of this type. While the Commission still feels that this plan of organization has merit, they are not recommending it at this time.

Instead, the Commission is recommending that there be no change in the institutions under the Trustees of the University of Tennessee and that a new board, to be known as the Trustees for State Universities, be established to govern the six state universities now under the State Board of Education. This

board should have nine members, appointed for staggered nine year terms, and no county with a state university in it should have more than one member on the board. No member of the board should be on the staff of any of the public colleges or universities. This board should have a competent professional staff headed by a Chancellor, who has had substantial administrative experience in higher education. The Governor and the Director of the Higher Education Commission should be ex officio members of this board. If the Legislature acts favorably on this proposal, the board could be created by the summer of 1969, but the institutions should remain under the State Board of Education until July 1, 1970, in order to give the new board time to assemble a staff and to prepare for an orderly assumption of responsibilities at the beginning of a fiscal year.

If these recommendations are followed, the state will have a coordinating board (The Higher Education Commission) and three operating boards: the University of Tennessee Trustees, the Trustees for State Universities, and the Trustees for the Community Colleges. The State Department of Education would continue to be responsible for grades one through twelve, the special schools, and the area vocational schools.

The Commission feels that this pattern of organization will provide for a clear and manageable set of responsibilities for each Board. The number of institutions in each system is small enough so that each Board and its professional staff can become well acquainted with each institution in the system.

The Higher Education Commission would continue its responsibilities for coordinating the programs of all the public institutions under the community college board, the Trustees for State Universities, and the Trustees of the University of Tennessee. Program and budgetary review and responsibilities for long range planning would continue to be the functions of the Higher Edu-

cation Commission, but the responsibility for governing the institution, including policy formulation, and appointments of major staff, legal responsibility for the real property of the institutions, and the other responsibilities normally assigned to a governing board would be assigned to these two new boards, just as they have been the legal responsibilities of the current Board of Higher Education.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

This first part of the Commission's long range plan recommends the general level and type of program offerings at each of the public institutions, and makes recommendations to the Governor and General Assembly about the way that our public colleges and universities should be organized and governed.

The Commission recommends the following goals for higher education:

1) The State of Tennessee should provide opportunities for higher education for all citizens who have the ability and interest in attending college.
2) The state should provide a system of public institutions which furnish the educational programs, research, and services in higher education required by the economic and social development needs of the state.
3) The state should provide advanced graduate and professional program offerings to serve the demands of an expanding number of Tennesseans who will seek education beyond the baccalaureate degree.
4) The state should support all of its programs of higher education at a level which will enable the institution to compete effectively for faculty, and to provide the equipment, supplies, and facilities needed for a modern program of instruction.
5) It should be a goal of the state to achieve full accreditation of all its programs, and each institution should obtain accreditation for its existing programs before new ones are started.

The following recommendations are designed to move the state toward the goals:

1) By 1975 the state should develop a community college system with 12 to 15 community colleges.
2) Memphis State University should be developed as a comprehensive university offering work in a variety of fields at the doctoral level.
3) All institutions should strengthen their undergraduate programs, develop strong master's degree programs, and strengthen all professional programs so that they can achieve professional accreditation.
4) A careful study of the need for additional doctoral programs should be made in the early 1970's, with the view to establishing additional doctoral programs at other state institutions as the needs develop and as resources make it possible to finance the additional programs. For the immediate future, doctoral program development should be limited to the campuses at UT Knoxville, UT Memphis Medical Units, and Memphis State University.
5) The state should establish a nine member board to be known as the "Trustees for Community Colleges" to govern the community colleges now under the State Board of Education.
6) The state should establish a nine member board to be known as the "Trustees of State Universities" to govern the six universities now under the State Board of Education.

TABLE I

PROJECTED ENROLLMENT IN TENNESSEE*

	1967	1975	1980
UT Knoxville	17,968	26,000	28,000
Medical Center	1,665	2,000	2,000
Memphis State	15,101	22- 23,000	26,000
Complex Multipurpose Total	34,734	50- 51,000	56,000
Tennessee Tech	5,593	6- 7,000	7- 8,000
East Tennessee	8,903	11- 12,000	12- 13,000
Middle Tennessee	6,257	10- 11,000	11- 12,000
UT Chattanooga	---	5- 6,000	8- 9,000
Austin Peay	2,917	4- 5,000	5- 6,000
UT Martin	3,250	5- 6,000	5- 6,000
Tennessee A & I	4,793	4- 5,000	5- 6,000
Regional Universities Total	31,713	45- 52,000	53- 60,000
Resident Centers	5,200	7- 8,000	8- 9,000
Community Colleges			
Metropolitan	---	8- 11,000	15- 18,000
Other	2,342	12- 14,000	13- 15,000
Total Community Colleges	2,342	20- 25,000	28- 33,000
Total Public	73,989	122-136,000	145-158,000
Private	31,960	42- 44,000	45- 48,000
TOTAL	105,949	164-180,000	190-206,000